DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 216 360 CS 206 879

AUTHOR Comprone, Joseph J.
TITLE It Is the Poem that I Remake: Using Kenneth Burke's Pentad to Help Students Write about Robert Frost's 'Mending Wall.'
PUB DATE Mar 82
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Meeting of the Kentucky Council of Teachers of English Spring Conference (Louisville, KY, March 26-27, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Techniques; *Critical Reading; Higher Education; *Literary Criticism; *Literature Appreciation; *Poetry; *Questioning Techniques; Rhetorical Criticism; Secondary Education; Teaching Methods; Writing (Composition); Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Frost (Robert); Mending Wall; Reader Response

ABSTRACT

The teaching-questioning strategy developed in this paper, based on reader-response criticism and Kenneth Burke's pentad, can be used by teachers to elicit responses to any literary work and is designed to help students participate in a work's dramatic context, discover meaning as they read, and assure that their critical essays are based on an appreciation of the internal structures of a literary work. An explanation of Burke's pentad shows that every act of communication contains an agent who acts through language, an agency enabling the agent to act, a scene in which the verbal action takes place, an action that can be abstracted from the overall situation and represented as an event, and a purpose guiding the developing verbal action from beginning to end. Following this explanation, other sections of the paper illustrate the application of the strategy to Robert Frost's "Mending Wall." One section notes that teachers must analyze the work to find which of the five elements are most important and to pinpoint where each dominates the act of reading. Another section offers a set of directions, response-questions, and writing exercises that will help teachers bring students to an understanding of reading as an active process in which meaning evolves from give and take among perspectives. Concluding sections of the paper provide examples of ways teachers can build subjective and objective responses to "Mending Wall." (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED216360

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

It Is The Poem That I Remake: Using Kenneth Burke's Pentad To Help Students Write About Robert Frost's 'Mending Wall.'

Joseph J. Comprone

I
Background Theory

Recent literary theory has begun to re-focus our attention as teachers. Structuralists and reader-response critics encourage teachers to make the "act" of reading the central concern in our teaching, just as many educational theorists in the 20th century have encouraged teachers to move from a focus on subject to a focus on students as they learn.[1] What types of questions might teachers who wish to attend to the actual reading process rather than to the end result--the message or final meaning--ask themselves as they prepare to teach a modern poem, in this case, Robert Frost's "Mending Wall"? Can these questions be used to develop a methodology that might be transferred from one piece of literature to another, from one course to another, from one group of students to another--without sacrificing the teaching of critical reading skills? This essay will develop a strategy, based on reader-response criticism and Kenneth Burke's pentad, that teachers can apply to any literary work. The strategy will help students participate in a work's dramatic context, will help them discover meaning as they read, and will assure that their critical essays are based on an appreciation of the internal structures of a literary work.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joseph J. Comprone

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS206879

II
Burke's Pentad

Kenneth Burke, in several seminal works, has developed a critical strategy that might well become a literature teacher's most effective means of analyzing a complex literary work before using it to teach students how to read a literary work.[2] In outline, Burke's pentad is a simple concept. It suggests that every communication process is dramatic, that in every act of communication there is an agent who acts through language, there is an agency which enables the agent to act, there is a scene or background against which the verbal action is taken, there is an action that can be abstracted from the overall situation and represented as an event, and there is a purpose which guides the developing verbal action from beginning to end. Often these five elements, universal to every verbal situation, have been reduced to the more familiar journalistic questions--who, what, when, where, and how.[3] Such reductions, however, are not capable of helping teachers introduce students to the complex process of responding to literature simply because they fail to account for the more complex rhetorical contexts that are found in a literary work.

Literature, as James Moffett has argued in Teaching the Universe of Discourse, is the most symbolic and abstract form of discourse that any culture can produce.[4] When we read literature we are interpreting concrete, dramatic experience in abstract, symbolic terms. Denmark becomes a highly abstracted symbol of corruption in Hamlet; Hartford, Connecticut becomes a highly abstracted symbol of American materialism in Connecticut Yankee; Ahab's quest for the whale becomes a highly abstracted, almost emblematic symbol of human ambition and pride in a

neutral or malevolent universe in Moby Dick. This move from concrete referent to abstract, dramatic interpretive context seems natural enough to most experienced readers of literature, English teachers included. But it is most certainly a learned skill, something that beginners must be taught, if we wish, as teachers, to expand our students' experiential and conceptual backgrounds as they read.

Rhetorical criticism would explain literature's deceptively abstract nature from a different perspective than Moffett's. Any work of literature has, in essence, two rhetorical triads within its context: the first constructed from the speaker, subject, audience context in the work itself; the second constructed from the interaction of implied author, implied reader, and implied or "real" subject. On the first level, for example, "Mending Wall" is a poem told by a New England farmer, addressed by implication to a reader who assumes interest in the life represented in the poem (the rituals and functions of farming in New England), and concerning the particular activity of wall-mending. The interaction of dramatic components of speaker, subject, and audience are indeed complex on this level, but the reader of the poem can at least focus directly on dialogue, image, and action without worrying about ambiguities and ironies that evolve when focus is switched to the implied author's intention.

The second level of rhetorical interpretation is brought in once we consider what Robert Frost--pastoral and regional poet, master of dramatic irony--means to tell us through his rendering of the drama in this poem. Do we suppose an author who aligns himself with narrator, an enlightened spokesperson for progressive sharing of private property?

Or do we search out a covert respect for the old stone savage, armed with fences against the "advances," the more communal thinking of the narrator? Does the assumed author find nature benign, neutral, or malevolent? Questions such as these could be asked of implied subject and readers as well. When readers ask these types of questions they are superimposing the more complex, implied rhetorical context of author, reader, and subject upon the simpler narrative-dramatic context within the poem itself.

III
Application of the Pentad to "Mending Wall"

How, then, can the pentad be applied to literary works by teachers who wish to introduce students to the complex interaction between the surface and implied contexts of a literary work? The answer is simple enough, in theory. Teachers, must, first, analyze the work in order to find which of the five elements are most important and to pinpoint where each dominates the act of reading the poem. The following is the result of my application of the pentad to Robert Frost's "Mending Wall." Particularly in a complex work, keep in mind that two or more elements of the pentad may well operate at simultaneous textual moments. Also, it is important to remember that a reader arrives at a fuller understanding of dramatic context by considering the relationships (Burke calls them "ratios") among the elements of the pentad.

The first twenty-seven lines of the poem serve two dramatic functions: they establish the scene for the symbolic action that will follow--wall-mending; they define the agents--the actors--who will act in the rest of the poem. To understand the intricacies of symbolic

action in this poem, however, we must examine these two elements--scene and agent--in more detail. Frost, in all his work, posits a rugged natural world, often bereft of human inhabitants, certainly incapable of pathetic fallacy, and representing isolated, lonely human beings.[5] Human action, in Frost, is usually seen against the backdrop of nature's rugged insensitivity. A close look at lines 1-27, with this broader understanding in mind, reveals a complication in the proces of defining central agents for the poem. The poem's narrator is, at first, apparently sole agent: he tells us about the wall; he tells us about what happens to the wall; he and his neighbors have found the "gaps" in the wall; he notifies his neighbor and instigates the wall-mending; he describes how he and his neighbor mend the wall; indeed, he is also the one who reduces this work to game and play by antagonizing his neighbor and by reminding him of the uselessness of wall-mending. But a subterranean agent also acts through these twenty-seven lines--the "something" that destroys the wall, the human artifact ritualistically reconstructed every spring. It sometimes takes the form of "frozen-ground-swells," sometimes the form of hunters, sometimes the form of magic as it causes the stones to fall even as the neighbors mend. This opposition of human and natural agents creates a playful, agonistic context for the entire poem. We are watching a primal human game in which men work together to impose order on a potentially chaotic world. In fact, the culminating line of this first section explicitly labels wall-building "another kind of outdoor game."[6]

Scene also operates in two ways in these first twenty-seven lines. Lines 1-11 establish background for the action of wall-mending that

will take place more specifically later in the poem: we see the New England terrain symbolized in "frozen-ground-swells" and "boulders in the sun"; we know the background of ritualized, seasonal behavior--the hunters, the "yelping dogs," the yearly evolution of "spring mending-time"--that will serve as context for the wall-mending that takes place later. In lines 12-27, we are given the scenic foreground for the game: the narrator's ritual of notifying his neighbor; their ritual of line-walking; their "spelling" of the loave-stones that fall from assigned places. These later come to function as the game's rules.

Lines 1-27 of the poem, then, create a complex interrelationship of scene and agent. Experienced readers pick up all or at least some of this subconsciously. They, in a sense, feel the context that must be understood if the rest of the poem is to mean in a significant way. As teachers, then, it becomes our job to help students build this context, excuse the pun, from the "ground-swell" up. It is exactly at this point that I can clarify how Burke's pentad can help beginning readers. The elements of agent and scene become, with a first reading of lines 1-27 behind us, a means of shaping discussion and writing questions that will bring the subconscious bulk of the iceberg of literary context to the tip or surface of the beginning reader's attention.

IV
A Burkean Heuristic for Discovering the Dramatic Context of "Mending Wall"

Secondary and college readers would certainly be able to follow the surface language and narrative action of "Mending Wall." The diction and syntax are common enough, and the imagery is familiar

or, at least, easily compared with the student's experiences with rural life. Students would, however, need the teacher's help in coming to understand how the poem's language and structure take action against the reader, how these elements lead the reader toward and away from different perspectives on the poem's meaning.[7] Here is a set of directions, response-questions, and writing exercises that will help teachers bring students to an understanding of reading as an active process in which meaning evolves from give and take among perspectives.

1. Background: The teacher should pose questions about the title. Students might be asked to write a paragraph explaining what they think the poem will be about after reading only the title and discussing its implications. Does this sound like a poem about work? What are a reader's expectations when that question is answered affirmatively?

2. Before students read lines 1-12 of the poem they should be asked to look for two agents in competition with one another. The agents do not have to be human. After the twelve lines have been read, students should write two paragraphs describing the agents in the poem. Students should go back and gather evidence from the text to help make their definitions of agents clearer.

3. Students should read lines 12-27 with the idea of looking for a definition of setting or scene in the poem. After completing this reading, they should write a paragraph in which they generalize a definition of the scene in the poem, followed by a specific list of sensory elements, taken from the poem, that support the generalization. This is probably the time for a brief discussion of denotation and connotation, abstract and concrete, image and symbol, also drawing from words and images in the poem.

4. At this point, teachers should use terministic screens and perspectives by incongruity, two Burkean concepts, to shape a writing exercise that will ask students to look back, using their remarks on scene and agent, and forward (a "perspective by incongruity")to the rest of the poem.[8] When they play this hydra-headed critical role, looking backward and forward in the poem almost simultaneously, students will begin to develop a sense of what Burke means

by "terministic screens," the process by which a fluent reader first adopts the writer's terminology. This adopted terminology then is contrasted with, as reading progresses, the reader's ways of putting similar experiences and the poem's experience into words. Gradually, the writer's and the reader's terminologies come together to form a terminological screen through which the writer and reader come to view what were different experiences as one. These abstract terms, however, need not be taught to students; they are theories that are helpful in devising teaching strategies, such as the following:

> Describe in an introductory paragraph the "outdoor game" played by the narrator, the "old-stone savage," and nature in lines 28-45. Then, look back over your previous writings in response to sections one and two of the poem and explain the parts played by the scene (natural world) and the three agents (the narrator, the stone savage, and the undefined "magic" in nature) in the drama of the "outdoor game."[9]

This exercise ought to help students to objectify the dramatic action, to accomplish what E. D. Hirsch, Jr. would call the understanding of the inferred or "probable meaning" of the poem.[10] In this case, meaning is not simply paraphased; it is rendered in terms of the poem's dramatic action--a perspective that will help beginning readers of literature develop what Louise Rosenblatt class an "aesthetic stance" as they read.[11] They will, in other words, participate in the action represented in the poem before they begin to make critical statements. Putting participation before criticism ought to help teachers avoid plot summaries and oversimplified, didactic statements of meaning.

The last section of the poem (lines 28-45) refocuses the reader's attention on different elements of the pentad. Whereas lines 1-27 place emphasis on agents operating in a particular scenic context, the last section of the poem puts emphasis an agency (how the action is carried out) and action (what actual event takes place). The game becomes the poet's means of making a statement; the act of wall-building becomes the poet's key symbol, his way of representing indirectly an expository statement on the human condition in a world not governed by any formative purpose--or, at least, not one discoverable by man. The reader, to understand and appreciate the poem, must

construct a new level of meaning as he or she responds to the "out door game," the narrator's question, and the old-stone savage's ritual answer.

This new level of meaning, if reader-response criticism is at all correct in its analyses of the literary reading process, must be constructed from the results of readings of earlier parts of the text. The fifth and last exercise in our sequence of reading activities should, inconsequence, lead the students back to their earlier oral and written responses to lines 1-27 of the poem.

5. Read and discuss in workshop groups the last section of the poem (lines 28-45). Focus on the interaction between the narrator and the old stone savage. Why does the narrator ask his baiting question? What type of expression, what gestures--if any--does the old-stone savage portray as he answers? What tones of voice do both speakers use? What do you think the narrator is driving at? What does he wish to accomplish? Does he accomplish it? Who really has the last word? Once these questions have been discussed, students should take on the role of either the narrator or the old stone savage and answer these questions: As narrator, why do you feel that the maxim "good fences make good neighbors" should be questioned? What is the reasoning behind your questioning? As the old-stone savage, explain the truth of "good fences make good neighbors." Use as much of the poem as you can to develop your answers.

This writing exercises should help students use the dramatic interaction of outdoor game (agency) and wall-mending (action) to re-experience the previously established tension among agents in the poem. It should enable them to see beyond the surface images of the poem to a deeper irony in which neither the views of the narrator or the old-stone savage are dominant.

In most secondary and beginning college classrooms this sequence of activities would, I believe, be sufficient. It would teach the students to enter the dramatic context of a literary work as

participants; at the same time, it would help them develop distance and objectivity, or what Kenneth Burke calls "identification." Identification is a key concept throughout Burke's rhetoric; it represents the reader's partial sharing in and difference from the experience of the writer.[12] "Mending Wall" demands dramatic participation and a degree of critical-rational distance from its readers. Fluent readers speculate and participate simultaneously, using literary conventions and linguistic cues to direct their reaction to the context of the poem itself, using--in turn--dramatic participation to keep their more abstract critical speculations under control. The assignment sequence described above uses the act of writing to help students to participate and speculate, taking on increasingly more critical and abstract roles as they read.

V
Subjective and Objective Responses to "Mending Wall"

There are two alternatives available to teachers who would wish to take the response heuristic I have outlined here further up the ladder of abstraction. In college classes, both should be pursued, one after the other. In a secondary class, either one or the other could be managed with a relatively brief extension in time.

One alternative is subjective in nature. I do not agree with David Bleich when he argues that, because all knowledge of literature has its roots in felt response, that, in turn, all literature pedagogy should begin with subjective responses.[13] Without doubt, subjective response must be incorporated in the reading process, but I believe it should be brought in <u>after</u> the students have been helped by teachers to participate in the dramatic action of the poem itself--not as formal

critics but as participants in the literary "event." Moving in this direction from the activities I have already outlined would entail three general possibilities:

1. having students recall, list, and connect with the poem past events that seem related to their reading of "Mending Wall";

2. having students record notes on feelings they had while first reading the poem--first, in shorthand while reading the poem, then in fuller form after having participated in the heuristics described above;

3. having students go back over these two types of responses and compose an account of how their subjective reactions compared with their more objective first reactions to the dramatic context of the poem.

College teachers who might wish to build upon these earlier dramatic and subjective responses would bring the students to interpretations of authorial intention in the poem.[14] Many contemporary interpretations of this poem find irony in it, an irony in which the implied author is assumed to dismiss both the narrator's and the old-stone savage's points of view. In this type of reading, the ambiguity and tension inherent in the final lines of the poem between the narrator's and savage's ways of seeing fences is reconciled into the implied author's firm belief in the powers of ambiguity. Men must work together or they work apart, as Frost often suggested; the wisdom of "Mending Wall," this final reading suggests, evolves from an author who dramatically juxtaposes two divergent views of walls to construct a third view, a synthesis of the others. Men need walls--and things like them--to keep themselves together, to keep the spirit of community intact, even when "He is all pine and I am apple orchard." With out this sense of community,

nature succeeds in forcing men apart. What seems to keep men apart--walls, fences, work of all kinds--actually keeps them together.

Bringing students to this more objective level of interpretation would demand a reconstruction of the writings produced in response to particular dramatic sequences as they were defined in the first-stage dramatic activities, and it would depend on incorporation of subjective reactions as they were composed in the second-stage activities. Reconstructions of this sort would also demand more outside information--on Frost's work in general, on his biography, on general literary techniques such as irony and point of view and their function in literature in general.[15]

VI
What the Students Have Learned

Learning sequences such as those described above accomplish two general aims: they enable teachers to intervene in the reading process in ways that will assure that students "read" literature on an active, dramatic level before they engage in more abstract interpretation; they also assure that students develop habits of selection and prediction that are consistent with the current psycholinguistic model of reading when they read.[16]

Students will also have made specific gains in understanding "Mending Wall." First, they will have moved from what might have been a simple acceptance of the narrator's scepticism about walls in general to a more complex understanding of the tension between the narrator's and the old-stone savage's views in the poem. Second, from a simple

acceptance of a didactic moral concerning "good fences make good neighbors" the students will have moved to a more complex realization of the place of ambiguity in developing a set of moral beliefs--out of the tension between the narrator's and the old-stone savage's views comes a more complex synthesis of respect for and scepticism about the function of walls in human society. Third, students come to appreciate the complex relationship between the triad in the work and the triad of assumed author, reader, and subject that is implicit in all serious literature. They come to realize Frost's intentions, his use of a dramatically-realized game to render meaning symbolically. In the process, students involve themselves in a learning experience marked by what John Dewey described as "a sense of sharing in the consequences of what goes on" and, as a result, become more committed to learning as discovery rather than when they must simply reproduce information.[17]

Footnotes

[1] Reader-response criticism and the learn-by-doing educational theory of cognitive psychologists who work from a post-Dewey model strive for similar goals. Both work within a broader context within which learning to read becomes part of the larger circle of learning in general. Both approaches put major emphasis on the active participation of the reader-learner within the process of reading and learning. Frank Smith brings reading and general learning theory explicitly together in Understanding Reading, 2nd. ed. (New York: Holt, 1978). Wolfgang I ser succinctly summarizes the active participation of the reader in the making of literary meaning in his chapter on "The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach," The Implied Reader (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1974), pp. 274-294. James Moffett, in Teaching the Universe of Discourse, develops a learn-by-doing writing curriculum that progresses from concrete to abstract reading and writing, sequenced along a continuun that moves from personal narrative to public discourse (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968). He applies Dewey's functional learning theory directly to reading and writing in the schools. See "John Dewey, "Experience in Thinking," Democracy and Education (New York: Free Press, MacMillan, 1966), pp. 139-151.

[2] For general discussion of the pentad see Language as Symbolic Action, Pt. I, pp. 1-97 and Chapter Seven, "A Dramatistic View of

the Origins of Language and Postscripts on the Negative," pp. 419-479. The most thorough treatment of the pentad and the ratios among its components is presented in A Grammar of Motives (New York: Prentice Hall, 1945).

[3] An exception is William Irmscher's The Holt Guide to English, 2nd. ed. (New York: Holt, 1976), pp. 30-48. Irmscher provides sequences of complex questions on each element in the pentad; he suggests ways in which students might write "scenarios" that would use the pentad to dramatize particular writing topics; he suggests ways of exploring the negative aspects of each element; and he closes by relating the pentad to generating ideas for different types of discourse.

[4] Teaching the University of Discourse, pp. 50-53.

[5] John Lynen, in "Frost as Modern Poet," argues that Frost's pastoral-rural imagery and language become his means of imposing order on the modern, urban, and morally chaotic world (in Robert Frost: A Collection of Critical Essays, ed. by James M. Cox, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1962, p. 186). This order, rather than an essential component in nature, is actually entirely linguistic; it is imposed by Frost's narrators on situations that are in themselves often terrifyingly disordered, at least to human perception. Yvor Winters recognizes this fact in "Robert Frost: or the Spiritual Drifter as Poet," Robert Frost: A Collection of Critical Essays, p. 63. Winters, however, does not take Frost's representation of an amoral or even malevolent natural world as an ontological assertion; he seesit, in contrast, as an essential

lack of courage, the poet's inability to make definite moral choices.

[6] This and subsequent references to "Mending Wall" are taken from X. J. Kennedy's reprinting of the poem in Literature: An Introduction to Fiction, Poetry, and Drama, 2nd. ed. (Boston: Little-Brown, 1979), p. 750.

[7] Wolfgang Iser discusses the problem of multiple and shifting perspectives in the act of reading literature in The Act of Reading (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1978). See particularly his discussion of "theme and horizon" (p. 96 ff.), where he argues that previously read events become the background or "horizon" to the reader's focus on theme at any given moment in the reading process.

[8] The premises behind the terministic-screen concept are scattered throughout Burke's work. In Attitudes Toward History (Los Altos, California: Hermes Publications, 1959), p. 260 ff, Burke takes the "heads I win, tails you lose" mode of dichtomous thought then prevalent in the behavioral and positivistic sciences and uses it as the basis for a dialectic that transcends dichotomous thinking through the opposition and ultimate synthesis of the writer's and reader's terministic screens. In "Our Attempt to Avoid Mere Relativism," Language As Symbolic Action, pp. 52-62, Burke defines terministic screens as chunks of language that direct the reader's attention to a pattern of symbols or terms within the larger field of discourse that is represented by the whole text. The writer's particular structuring of terms becomes the reader's new perspective on a field of experience. Perspectives that are drawn from the writer's terminology are then placed beside

the reader's previously composed terms for the experience. The result is a more complex and synthesized "perspective by incongruity."

[9] In a recent College Composition and Communication article, "A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing," Linda Flower and John R. Hayes point out in detail how successful writers use successively written notes and drafts as means of discovering and reshaping what their primary goals are as they write (XXXII, Dec. 1981, 365-387). This idea of using writing to revise and reshape what is being written is the same type of thing I am asking for as students respond to a literary work. In responding to literature, however, the student must shape overall goals that outline different types of response and participation within the work as it unfolds its meaning at various levels.

[10] This is a paraphrase, not a direct quotation. Meaning, Hirsch argues, derives from the reader's understanding of the implied or "intrinsic genre" of a work, which is created by the author's careful placement of literary cues, conventions, and techniques within a specific dramatic context. See, especially, Validity in Interpretation, Chapter Three, "The Concept of Genres" (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), pp. 68-126.

[11] The Reader, The Text, and the Poem (Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1978), p. 27.

[12] The most condensed discussion of rhetorical "identification" appears on pp. 19-37 of Burke's A Rhetoric of Motives (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969).

[13] "... we are ... reminded that the essence of a symbolic work is not in its visible sensory structure or in its manifest semantic load but in its subjective re-creation by a reader ...." Readings and Feelings: An Introduction to Subjective Criticism (Urbana, Illinois: NCTE, 1975), p. 21.

[14] Frost, in his playfully enigmatic way, consistently denied the literary or political intentions that were often attributed to this poem by general readers and critics. The best known of these denials came about when Frost visited Moscow in August, 1962, as reported in Lawrance Thompson and R. H. Winnick's Robert Frost: The Later Years, 1938-1963 (New York: Holt, 1976), p. 316. In the midst of a series of readings to small private audiences Frost read "Mending Wall" to a group in Moscow. As Thompson and Winnick put it, "with the issue of Berlin still far from resolved, and with the wall the East Germans had erected in 1961 still drawing widespread criticism in the west, Frost's choice of this particular poem seemed inescapably political to many ...." But Frost persistently denied any political intent, and went on to add that he had had "lots of adventures with that poem .... People are frequently misunderstanding it or misinterpreting it. The secret of what it means I keep." In a letter to Leonidas W. Payne, Jr., Frost responded to a query on the meaning of "Mending Wall" with the remark that "I should be sorry if a single one of my poems stopped with either of those things [atmosphere and character]--stopped anywhere in fact. My poems--I should suppose everybody's poems--are all set to trip the reader head foremost

into the boundless." Selected Letters of Robert Frost, ed. by Lawrance Thompson (New York: Holt, 1964), p. 344. In both contexts, Frost seems to align himself with Iser's contention that the meaning of a poem is potentially infinite, never fully exhausted, and that to stop at any particular level is to impoverish the concept of "literary meaning" in its own right. Frank Lentricchia, of all the critic's commentson "Mending Wall," best describes Frost's emphasis on shared process rather than didactic meaning when he argues that "It is a poem that celebrates a process, not the thing itself.... The narrator ... is not committed to ends, but to the process itself which he sees as having nonutilatarian value." The reader, Lentricchia suggests, must also share in the narrator's savoring of the experience itself, its playful delight by taking on and trying out different perspectives on the drama, always balancing perspectives until a third perspective is synthesized from them. Robert Frost: Modern Poetics and the Landscape of Self (Durham: Duke University Press, 1975), p. 106.

[15] Readers, in other words, would have to possess various levels and kinds of information drawn from outside the poem's text itself in order to progress from their dramatic participation in the poem's meaning to what E. D. Hirsch, Jr. would call the "significance" of the experienced meaning. See Validity in Interpretation (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), p. 63.

[16] This model is succinctly summarized in Charles R. Cooper and Anthony R. Petrosky, "A Psycholinguistic View of the Fluent Reading Process," Journal of Reading (December 1976), 184-207.

[17] Democracy and Education, p. 147.